

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/761,160	01/20/2004	Darren Shakib	305335.01	3220
	7590 03/30/2007 CORPORATION		EXAMINER	
ONE MICROS	OFT WAY	RAYYAN, SUSAN F		
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		2167	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MO	3 MONTHS 03/30/2007 ELECTRONIC			RONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 03/30/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com ntovar@microsoft.com a-rydore@microsoft.com

		Applica	ation No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/761	,160	SHAKIB ET AL.	SHAKIB ET AL.			
		Examir	ner	Art Unit				
		Susan I	F. Rayyan	2167				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communic or Reply	ation appears on	the cover sheet	with the correspondence a	ddress			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAINS IN THE MAINS IN THE MAINS OF THE MA	ILING DATE OF 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no nication. tory period will apply and ill, by statute, cause the a	THIS COMMUN event, however, may d will expire SIX (6) M application to become	NICATION. a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this of ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on 28 December	2006.					
-) ☐ This action is			•			
3)								
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
4) 🖾	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)🛛	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restricti	on and/or electior	requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.						
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	a)⊡ accepted or	b) objected t	to by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any object	ion to the drawing(s	s) be held in abey	vance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner.	Note the attach	ned Office Action or form P	TO-152.			
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
,	Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	or foreign priority	under 35 U.S.C	. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a,	1. Certified copies of the priority d	ocuments have b	een received.					
	Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of				I Stage			
	application from the Internation	al Bureau (PCT R	Rule 17.2(a)).					
* (See the attached detailed Office action	for a list of the ce	rtified copies n	ot received.				
			Δ	wowhape auch 17, 7007				
			M	auch 17.7007				
Attachment(s)								
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	0.049)		w Summary (PTO-413) lo(s)/Mail Date				
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	U-340)		of Informal Patent Application				
	r No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/21/2006</u> .		6) 🔲 Other: _	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				

Application/Control Number: 10/761,160 Page 2

Art Unit: 2167

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-27 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on November 21, 2006 was filed before Final Office Action. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-11, 13-25,27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent Number 6,070,158 issued to Steven T. Kirsch et al ("Kirsch").

As per claim 1 Kirsch anticipates:

an infrequent word identifier that identifies infrequent words that occur in less than a threshold number of documents (see column 2, lines 25-32, 47-53);

a frequent word index that maps the location of documents that contain words that occur in more than the threshold number of documents (column 10, lines 30-35, 40-45, stop list and part of record);

an infrequent word index, maintained separately from the frequent word index, that maps the location of documents that contain the infrequent words (column 2, lines 45-54 and column 6, lines 64-67);

an index scanning component that, in response to a query containing an infrequent word, scans the infrequent word index to find the location of documents containing the infrequent word (column 2, lines 27-30,47-50).

As per claim 2, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch anticipates: wherein the frequent word index is stored by document (column 10, lines 40-45).

As per claim 3, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch anticipates: wherein the frequent word index is partitioned by document (column 10, lines 40-45).

Art Unit: 2167

As per claim 4, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch anticipates: wherein the frequent word index is distributed across multiple computing systems(column 6, lines 64-66).

As per claim 5, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch anticipates: wherein the infrequent word index is stored by document(column 6, lines 33-38).

As per claim 6, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch anticipates: wherein the infrequent word index is partitioned by document(column 6, lines 33-38).

As per claim 7, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch anticipates: wherein the infrequent word index is distributed across multiple computing computer systems (column 6, lines 64-66).

As per claim 8, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch anticipates: wherein the infrequent word index is stored by word (column 10, lines 20-26).

As per claim 9, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch anticipates: wherein the infrequent word index is partitioned by word (column 10, lines 20-26).

Art Unit: 2167

As per claim 10, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch anticipates: wherein the infrequent word index is stored on a single computing computer system (column 6, lines 64-66).

As per claim 11, same as claim arguments above and anticipates:

wherein the index scanning component, in response to a user query containing an infrequent word, retrieves document locations for documents having the infrequent word from the infrequent word index (column 2, lines 27-30,47-50) and transmits the retrieved document locations to computer systems containing frequent word indexes for the retrieved documents (column5, lines 19-27).

As per claims 13,18 Kirsch anticipates:

scanning the set of documents and gathering infrequent words that occur in a number of documents of the set of documents that is less than a threshold amount (see column 2, lines 25-32, 47-53);

constructing an infrequent word index that maps infrequent words to locations of documents that contain the infrequent words(column 2, lines 45-54);

constructing a frequent word index, separately maintained from the infrequent word index, that maps frequent words that occur in a number of documents of the set of documents that is greater than the threshold amount to locations of documents that contain the frequent words(column 10, lines 30-35, 40-45, stop list and part of record and column 6, lines 64-67);

Art Unit: 2167

and examining the terms in the user query to identify any terms are infrequent words; and searching the infrequent word index for the terms that are identified as infrequent words(column 2, lines 27-30,47-50).

As per claim 14, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch anticipates: comprising storing the infrequent word index in a dedicated computer system(column 6, lines 64-66).

As per claim 15, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch anticipates: comprising storing the infrequent word index in dedicated partitions on computer systems that also store the frequent word index (column 6, lines 64-66).

As per claim 16, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch anticipates: comprising storing the infrequent index by word. (column 10, lines 20-26).

As per claim 17, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch anticipates: comprising storing the infrequent index by document(column 6, lines 33-38).

As per claim 19 Kirsch anticipates:

identifying infrequent words that occur in less than a threshold number of documents(see column 2, lines 25-32, 47-53);

mapping, in a frequent word index, the location of documents that contain words that occur in more than the threshold number of documents in a frequent word index(column 10, lines 30-35, 40-45, stop list and part of record);

maintaining, separately from the frequent word index, an infrequent word index that maps the location of documents that contain the infrequent words(column 2, lines 45-54 and column 6, lines 64-67);

in response to a query containing an infrequent word, scanning the infrequent word index to find the location of documents containing the infrequent word(column 2, lines 27-30,47-50).

As per claim 20, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch anticipates: wherein the infrequent word index is stored by document(column 6, lines 33-38).

As per claim 21, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch anticipates: wherein the infrequent word index is partitioned by document(column 6, lines 33-38).

As per claim 22, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch anticipates: wherein the infrequent word index is distributed across multiple computing computer systems(column 10, lines 20-26).

As per claim 23, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch anticipates:

wherein the infrequent word index is stored by word (column 10, lines 20-26).

As per claim 24, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch anticipates:

wherein the infrequent word index is partitioned by word (column 10, lines 20-26).

As per claim 25, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch anticipates: wherein the infrequent word index is stored on a single computing computer system(column 6, lines 64-66).

As per claim 27 Kirsch anticipates:

means for scanning the set of documents and gathering infrequent words that occur in a number of documents that is less than a threshold amount; means for constructing an infrequent word index that maps infrequent words to locations of documents that contain the words(see column 2, lines 25-32, 47-53);

means for constructing a frequent word index, separately maintained from the infrequent word index, that maps frequent words that occur in a number of documents that is greater than the threshold amount to locations of documents that contain the frequent words(column 10, lines 30-35, 40-45, stop list and part of record and column 6, lines 64-67);

and means for examining the terms in the user query to identify any terms are infrequent words and means for searching the infrequent word index for the identified infrequent words (column 2, lines 27-30,45-54 and column 6, lines 64-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirsch as applied to claims 1, 19 above, and further in view of US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0032772 issued to Bjorn Olstad ("Olstad").

As per claim 12, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch does not explicitly teach an index cache. Olstad does teach a index cache (paragraph 85, lines 1-4) to improve relevancy in search services (paragraph 18). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Kirsch with an index cache to improve relevancy in search services as described by Olstad (paragraph 18).

As per claim 26, same as claim arguments above and Kirsch does not explicitly teach

Art Unit: 2167

including an index cache. Olstad does teach a index cache (paragraph 85, lines 1-4) to improve relevancy in search services (paragraph 18). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Kirsch with an index cache to improve relevancy in search services as described by Olstad (paragraph 18).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed December 28, 2006 have been fully considered but 5. they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., determining the frequency of a word, determining the frequency of an infrequent word, based on the number of documents and evaluating frequency based on the number of documents) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant argues that Kirsh does not teach "identifies infrequent words that occur in less than a threshold number of document. Examiner has interpreted this limitation similar to the specification (page 7, lines 1-2) wherein the threshold is associated with the number of occurrences over the data set to determine frequent or infrequent words. Kirsh teaches at column 10, lines, 30-32 (term frequency) frequency of occurrence exceeds some threshold of occurrence over some set of documents. Kirsh, column 2,

lines 4-53 describe a web search service which indexes documents by first removing the words which appear too "frequent" leaving the "infrequent" terms to be indexed. The words not identified as frequent words are the infrequent words.

Applicant argues Kirsh does not teach "an infrequent word index maintained separately from frequent word index". Kirsh teaches this at column 6, 64-65, as separate indexes).

Applicant argues Kirsh does not teach "frequent word index". Kirsh teaches this limitation at column 10, lines 30-45 as identify frequencies of occurring terms over at threshold set of documents. Frequent terms are added to stoplist. The term list is associated with the document and a cumulative number of occurrences of each term, word count of document and document ID. In addition describes a phrase stop list (column 10, lines, 53 to column 11, line 30 describes indexing a phrase stop list.

Art Unit: 2167

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2167

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Rayyan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1675. The examiner can normally be reached M-F: 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Susan Rayyan

March 17, 2007

CHONG H. KHM